

ORIGINAL
RECEIVED

BEFORE THE

Federal Communications Commission

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20554

MAR 16 1993

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of

Rulemaking to Amend Part 1 and)
 Part 21 of the Commission's Rules)
 to Redesignate the 27.5-29.5 GHz)
 Frequency Band and to Establish)
 Rules and Policies for Local)
 Multipoint Distribution Service)

CC Docket No. 92-297

To: The Commission

COMMENTS OF STEVEN P. SEITER

Steven P. Seiter hereby submits his comments in response to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the captioned proceeding, released January 8, 1993.

As one of the original applicants for 28 GHz spectrum, Mr. Seiter has monitored developments in the LMDS arena very carefully over the last two years. Mr. Seiter believes this new industry holds tremendous promise. With the recommendations set forth below, she endorses the Commission's adoption of the proposed LMDS rules.

I. Technical Issues

In the NPRM, the FCC recognized the virtue of a flexible structure for technical standards for deployment of 28 GHz systems, in light of the variety of distinct services which are envisaged for operation in this spectrum. NPRM at ¶¶ 23-24. Mr.

No. of Copies rec'd
 044
 00A800E

Seiter endorses the Commission's view that "only limited technical regulations may be needed to insure adequate interference control and coordination of services at the interfaces of the designated service areas." Id.

However, the text of the proposed rule on this point, Section 21.1012-Spectrum Utilization, does not reflect the technical flexibility recommended in the NPRM itself. Proposed Section 21.1012 would require that applications "contain detailed descriptions of the cellular configuration..., the modulation method," and other technical parameters. Mr. Seiter believes it is far too early in the development of the LMDS service, given significant strides expected in the next twelve to twenty-four months, to require that a 28 GHz licensee's polarization and modulation schemes be cast in stone in its application. Mr. Seiter antici-

of an individual applicant's utilization plan precisely what specific frequency stability characteristics the applicant will utilize.

Interference between adjacent service areas should not be a problem given the strong signal capture effect which either FM or digital signals exhibit. A 20 dB differential in signal levels will be sufficient to eliminate harmful levels of electrical interference to adjacent service areas. Thus, adjacent area interference control should be based upon a 20 dB desired-undesired signal ratio. This margin should be achievable consistently as long as licensees ensure that their customers' receive antennas are directionalized and properly adjusted.

Finally, because 28 GHz systems will be built at different rates from one service area to another, licensees should be required to demonstrate a minimum of 20 dB desired-undesired signal ratio to theoretical receive sites in adjacent area systems prior to construction of any cell with five miles of the borders of such service areas. This requirement will ensure that no prohibitive interference is caused to operational adjacent area systems.

II. Service Areas

Mr. Seiter has serious reservations about the wisdom of the Basic Trading Area format proposed in the NPRM. In any number of major metropolitan areas -- San Francisco and Los Angeles, to mention only two -- the BTA envelopes an enormous population,

larger even than the Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas in which those markets are located. For example, the Los Angeles BTA encompasses approximately 14.8 million people and extends all the way to the Arizona border. Under the proposed 90 percent coverage requirement, the Los Angeles licensee would have to be capable of serving a population of 13.3 million within three years. To require that a single licensee serve such a populous area within such a brief frame of time may be fundamentally impractical.

In more sparsely populated regions of the country, such as the west and northwest where one BTA can cover many thousands of square miles, the practical limitations of the LMDS cellular configuration are even more obvious. For example, the Billings, Montana and Reno, Nevada BTAs each cover in excess of 100,000 square miles. Nor are the major concentrations of people necessarily within the primary metropolitan area. In the case of Billings, for instance, the population of the entire county is less than 25 percent of the overall population of the BTA.

In short, under a BTA format and depending upon the service area, either (1) a licensee simply may not be able to underwrite the cost of building out 90 percent of the BTA and thus expose itself to loss of its license, or (2) if the 90 percent coverage

Thus, in the event that the Commission were to adopt the BTA
approach, Mr. Seiter recommends the refinements to the rule as

the "letter perfect" standard. This would eliminate the considerable administrative burden existing under current Part 21 rules where only substantial compliance is required for acceptability. On this score, the FCC's experience with the "letter perfect" approach in, for example, the FM radio service, has confirmed its virtue for processing purposes. By contrast, Mr. Seiter believes that the "post-card" format has the potential for significant abuse by application mills, given the FCC's concomitant proposal to permit tentative selectees up to thirty days to submit a complete proposal once their applications are selected for processing.

In this connection, the one-calendar-day filing opportunity proposed in the NPRM may or may not be appropriate depending upon the application requirements the Commission ultimately adopts. For example, if a thirty day public notice were issued announcing

~~the expiration of an NPRM filing window in twenty-five months, such~~

important objective, it is more important that LMDS tentative selectees be entities which are not speculating but genuinely intend to construct and develop their market. The "post-card" method, *a fortiori*, has the potential for jeopardizing that superior objective.

IV. Demonstration of Financial Qualifications

Mr. Seiter endorses the "firm financial commitment" approach proposed in the NPRM. Along with other measures outlined in the NPRM, this will be an additional protection against the abuses available when an applicant is required only to certify reasonable assurance of financing. It is commonly recognized that bank letters purportedly conveying "reasonable assurance," as a practical matter, give the Commission little confidence that the subject funds are genuinely available. For this reason, it is not surprising that other services administered by the FCC have also abandoned the reasonable assurance concept in favor of the more reliable firm financial commitment requirement.

He notes an error, however, in the phrasing of the proposed rule itself (Section 21. 1011). Subparagraph (c) of the rule states that applicants relying upon non-institutional funding must submit proof that the financing entity has not committed the funds in question to any other LMDS application. He presumes the FCC intends this restriction to preclude an applicant's relying on the same committed funds for applications in more than one market. It is easily conceivable that one lender may be willing to make

its funds available to whomever the tentative selectee is in a given market, meaning that commitment letters may issue to more than one application in a single market. Proposed Section 21.1011 should be corrected accordingly.

A similar clarification should be made to the phrasing of proposed Section 21.1010, governing interests in LMDS applications. Read literally, the rule would prohibit an entity from holding an interest in LMDS applications in *different* markets. He is aware of no public interest-related concern which the rule in that form might have been intended to address. Indeed, that rendering of the rule is directly at odds with the FCC's discussion at Paragraph 45 of the NPRM. Accordingly, the rule should be clarified to specify that one entity may not hold an interest in more than one applicant "in the same market."

V. Cross-Ownership

Mr. Seiter opposes ownership by cable companies in LMDS licensees serving the same market. It is beyond cavil that a principal purpose for the Commission's creation of the LMDS service is to promote competition in the video entertainment marketplace. Although LMDS will have various applications, the principal use of the 28 GHz spectrum in the near term will be video distribution. For this reason, it would be unwise for the Commission to allow cable companies to have an interest in local LMDS facilities. The regulatory oversight required to prevent anti-competitive abuses would not be outweighed by the theoretical

prospect that the cable company as an IMDS licensee might imple-

creative possibilities for uses of this technology are too important to deprive smaller LMDS aspirants the opportunity to bring good ideas to fruition merely because they lack the financial wherewithal to bid competitively for an LMDS license. Whatever other services may be well suited for the auction approach, LMDS is not one of them. He therefore recommends that auction authority not be sought in connection with this service.

VII. Conclusion

Mr. Seiter applauds the Commission's efforts to launch the LMDS industry expeditiously. He believes that LMDS holds tremendous promise for bringing rapidly evolving technology to consumers in very short order. Modified to incorporate the changes recommended herein, the new rules will facilitate the development of this industry and should be adopted quickly.

Respectfully submitted,

STEVEN P. SEITER

By: *Ronald D. Maines*
Ronald D. Maines
MAINES & HARSHMAN, CHRTD.
Suite 900
2300 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 223-2817

His Attorneys

March 16, 1993